



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,458	01/23/2002	Christopher Pasqualino	13316US02	1287
23446 7590 04/24/2007 MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661			EXAMINER WONG, WARNER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/24/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/057,458	PASQUALINO, CHRISTOPHER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Warner Wong	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 6-10 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hobbs (US 5,751,366)

Regarding claim 6, Hobbs describes a method of communicating video signals over a communications link comprising shortening a blanking period in the data to accommodate auxiliary data (fig. 2-5, col. 3, lines 14-20, shortening the horizontal sync pulse during the horizontal blanking period to accommodate audio (auxiliary data)).

Regarding claim 7, Hobbs describes modifying a HSYNC signal in the data to accommodate the auxiliary data (fig. 2-5, col. 3, lines 14-20, shortening the horizontal sync pulse during the horizontal blanking period to accommodate audio (auxiliary data)).

Regarding claim 8, Hobbs describes that the auxiliary data may be audio data (fig. 2-5, col. 3, lines 14-20, shortening the horizontal sync pulse during the horizontal blanking period to accommodate audio (auxiliary data)).

Regarding claim 20, Hobbs further describes a system for communicating data and auxiliary data over a video communications link, comprising:

a reformatter for shortening a blanking period in the data to accommodate auxiliary data, forming at least one frame (fig. 7 & col. 4, lines 38-39, video logic 27);

a transmitter for communicating with said reformatter and transmitting said at least one frame over the communication link (fig. 7 & col. 4, lines 62-64, inherent transmitter for transmission of the video signals).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 9 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hobbs in view of Martin (WO 00/14626).

Regarding claim 9, Hobbs fails to describe that the communication link is a digital communication link.

Martin describes that the communication link is a digital communication link (p. 8, receiving incoming digital data from a number of peripherals).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply the generic video transmission method of Hobbs which includes audio signal to the video data transfer between the processor and display of Martin.

The motivation for combining the teachings is that it reduces the need of a separate transmission carrier/signaling for transmitting audio (Hobbs, col. 1, lines 11-14).

Regarding claim 10, Hobbs describes frames which the auxiliary data is to be transmitted, but fails to describe modifying a VSYNC signal in all such frames.

Martin describes modifying a VSYNC signal in all frames (p. 10 & fig. 6, during (each) vertical blanking period which is used for synchronizing the (all) next frames (VSYNC signal), inserting STARTBLANK into the period (modifying VSYNC)).

Regarding claim 11, Hobbs fails to describe inserting a notch in all said VSYNC signals.

Martin describes inserting a notch in all said VSYNC signals (p. 10 & fig. 6, where during (each) vertical blanking period which is used for synchronizing the next frames (VSYNC signal), a start blanking pulse STARTBLANK (notch) is inserted during the period) to mark/indicate additional data is present.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to insert a notch in the VSYNC signals to let the receiving side know that there is additional data present in the transmission.

The motivation for combining the teachings is that it would clearly indicate the time at which additional data present in the transmission.

Regarding claim 12, Hobbs and Martin combined describe all limitations set forth in claim 11 for inserting a notch in the VSYNC signals, but fail to describe that inserting the notch includes inserting an 8 clock cycle pulse into said VSYNC signals.

However, inserting a notch of 8 clock cycle pulse which is considered to be optimal for audio packets of DVI-CE standard present no new or unexpected results with other lengths to for audio/auxiliary packets, so long as the packet is being accordingly transmitted and processed in a

Art Unit: 2616

successful way. See MPEP 2144.05 and In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235(CCPA 1955).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the invention of Martin to insert an 8 clock cycle notch into said VSYNC signals n to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

Regarding claim 13, Hobbs and Martin combined describe all limitations set forth in claim 11 for inserting a notch in the VSYNC signals, but fail to describe that the notch is inserted into said VSYNC signals 8 clock pulses after a first edge of said VSYNC signals.

However, inserting a notch 8 clock pulses after the first edge of the VSYNC signal present no new or unexpected results with other timeframes to insert the notch (for audio/auxiliary packets), so long as the packet is being accordingly transmitted and processed in a successful way. See MPEP 2144.05 and In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235(CCPA 1955).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the invention of Martin to insert a notch 8 clock cycle pulses after the first edge of the VSYNC signal to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

3. Claims 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hobbs as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Kim (6,870,930).

Regarding claim 14, Hobbs describes all limitations set forth in claim 10.

Hobbs lacks what Kim describes: adapting control signals (col. 9, lines 12-16) to be compliant with the HDCP (content protection) standard (col. 9, lines 37-64, where the control signals sent during DE low period are corrupted according to the DE corruption protocol which complies with HDCP.)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to adapt (secure) the video control signals of Hobbs to a content protection standard as per Kim.

The motivation being that "There is [also] a need for secure communication as a result of increase value of the communicated content [control signals] and the increased likelihood that communicated content will be copied or altered", Kim, col. 1, lines 30-34).

Regarding claim 15, Hobbs fails to describe that the control signal is transmitted while in the blank period when the auxiliary data is transmitted.

Kim describes that the control signal is transmitted while in the blank period [when the auxiliary data is transmitted] (col. 9, lines 37-64).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to transmit the control signal while in the blanking period also.

The motivation being that "There is [also] a need for secure communication as a result of increase value of the communicated content [control signals] and the increased likelihood that communicated content will be copied or altered", Kim, col. 1, lines 30-34).

Regarding claim 16, Hobbs fails to describe that the control signal is ctl3.

Kim further describes that (one of the) control signals is ctl3 (col. 9, lines 15, control[3]).

Art Unit: 2616

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to transmit the control signal ctl3 while in the blanking period also.

The motivation being that "There is [also] a need for secure communication as a result of increase value of the communicated content [control signals] and the increased likelihood that communicated content will be copied or altered", Kim, col. 1, lines 30-34).

Regarding claim 17, Hobbs and Kim describe all limitations set forth in claim 14.

Hobbs fails to describe that the content protection standard comprises a High bandwidth Digital Content Protection (HDCP) standard.

Kim describes that the content protection standard comprises a High bandwidth Digital Content Protection (HDCP) standard (col. 9, line 64).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to transmit signals using HDCP standard. The motivation being that "There is [also] a need for secure communication as a result of increase value of the communicated content and the increased likelihood that communicated content will be copied or altered", Kim, col. 1, lines 30-34).

Regarding claim 18, Hobbs fails to describe adapting the control signal comprises generating a ctl3 input using at least one VSYNC signal.

Kim describes adapting the control signal comprises generating a ctl3 input using at least one VSYNC signal (col. 9, lines 12-16, where control[3] (ctl3) signal is generated & sent during the low (blanking) periods in tandem with (using) VSYNC signals).

Art Unit: 2616

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to transmit the control signal ctl3 when the synchronization (VSYNC) signals are also transmitted in the blanking period.

The motivation being that "There is [also] a need for secure communication as a result of increase value of the communicated content [ctl3 signals] and the increased likelihood that communicated content will be copied or altered", Kim, col. 1, lines 30-34).

Regarding claim 19, Hobbs and Kim combined describes generating a ctl3 input, but fails to explicitly describe ensuring that the ctl3 input is a positive going pulse.

However, whether if ctl3 is a positive or negative going pulse present no new or unexpected results, so long as the adaptation of the control signal signifies the processing in a successful way. See MPEP 2144.05 and In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235(CCPA 1955).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the invention of Hobbs & Kim to comprise a positive going pulse for the ctl3 input to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19, so long as the adaptation of the control signal signifies the processing in a successful way

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 3/7/07 have been fully considered but some are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2616

The applicant argues from the 4th paragraph on p. 4 to the 1st paragraph of p. 5 that Hobbs does not teach "shortening a blanking period". The examiner respectfully disagrees.

The examiner has consulted senior examiners who concur that the Hobbs reference (fig. 2-3 & col. 7-15) clearly teaches "shortening a blanking period" as per the previous and current Office Action: "In actual practice, interval T is about 4 milliseconds .. this invention shortens W to W1".

The applicant also argues in the 2nd paragraph on p. 5 that Hobbs does not teach "modifying a HSYNC signal pulse." Again, from the consultation, it is clear that the Hobbs reference describes a modification of the HSYNC signal pulse, as recited in the previous and current Office Action (shortening the HSYNC pulse from fig. 2 to fig. 3).

Regarding the argument in the 3rd paragraph on p. 5, the examiner now rejects claim 10 using a 103 rejection versus the previous 102 rejection, thus issuing this non-final Office Action. Prolonged prosecution is regretted.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Warner Wong whose telephone number is 571-272-8197. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30AM - 3:00PM, M-F.

Art Unit: 2616

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kwang Yao can be reached on 571-272-3182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Warner Wong
Examiner
Art Unit 2616

WW

KWANG BIN YAO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

